UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,867	11/19/2003	Hiroshi Chishima	17261	9342

23389   7590   04/29/2008
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/717,867
Filing Date: November 19, 2003
Appellant(s): CHISHIMA, HIROSHI

Katherine R. Vieyra
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 2/21/08 appealing from the Office action

mailed 8/9/07.

(1)   Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial

proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the

Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection

contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is

correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under

appeal.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 3-23, 28, and 29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Shigemi et al., USPN 6,314,434 filed (10/8/1998).

In reference to independent claim 1, Shigemi teaches:

The structured data management system is a strong tool that supports a variety

of business activities in the enterprise by linking many objects that express their

structure and behavior. See column 5, lines 46-67. The above mentions business

method teaches an information service which, when utilized, requires extension of

markup language/meta information. In reference to limitation 'an application program

downloaded when an information service requiring an extension of a markup language

or meta-information is used', the application program could be the actual script

associated with the nodes for separating data from processes. Since the proposed

system is designed to handle various business documents as one of the structured data

objects, SGML-based documents can readily be subjected to the system. The

management/control scripts can be divided into three groups as follows. The first kinds

of scripts are used to control the processing engine. For example, one script is used to

load SGML documents related to a management object into the structured data

management unit. The third kind of management/control scripts is used to record the

history of events and messages that have been processed by the processor engine. Still

another script supports copyright protection for the scripts of management objects. See

column 10, lines 5-67. The scripts taught by Shigemi provide an application program

downloaded when an information service requiring an extension of markup language or

meta information is used. The scripts read on an application program (as presently claimed) and refer to an extension of markup language or meta information.

The script interpreter parses and executes MIPS scripts which contain the process definition concerning each management object. Furthermore, although the SGML and MIPS have been chosen in the embodiment, the present invention is not limited to these particular language specifications. As an alternative to SGML, XML can be used to produce DTDs. Instead of MIPS, any interpreter languages can be used for scripting processes (compare to "*a document parser unit for converting document data into structured document information according to an instruction from an application program*"). See column 9, lines 15-45 and column 10, lines 20-54. Although the reference fails to explicitly state a document parser it provides a suggestion of parsing SGML and XML data into structured document data (and or nodes) to read out a relationship description associated with the target instance. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the well known business document system taught by Shigemi and modified the parser to produce DTD's from both SGML and XML for clearly separating data from processes.

Each structured electronic data object is associated with relevant process scripts that describe how the individual nodes will behave (compare to "*a document information manipulation unit for enabling the structured document information to be referred from the application program*"). See column 5, lines 45-55.

Depending on the content of each active process, a work list written in the Hyper Text Markup language (HTML) is delivered from the processing engine to the client

process. This processing engine is constructed within a WWW server, while the client

process is a WWW browser (compare to "***a browser core unit for displaying a***

document based on the structured document information according to an

instruction from the application program"). See column 10, lines 10-21.

If the two versions have an explicit relationship, the structured data processing

unit continues the process according to the inter-node relationships being defined

explicitly. The structured data processing unit the prompts the user to enter an

appropriate instruction, while showing him/her the current situation of both structured

data objects (compare to "***event information informing unit for, when an event***

relating to a displayed document takes place, informing the application program

of event information indicating a type of the event and a part of the document

where the event takes place"). See column 6, lines 51-67.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Shigemi teaches:

The client environment allows the user to interact with the system through a

graphical user interface. The client environment further provides the edit tool and other

software development tools. The client process sends messages to the processing

engine in response to inputs from the user or the edit tool. See column 11, lines 13-25.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Shigemi teaches:

Each structured electronic data object is associated with relevant process scripts

that describe how the individual nodes will behave. See column 5, lines 45-50.

Messages addressed to an obsolete node can still be handled in the new organization

model. Even if the node itself cannot be found in the new version, the structured data

processing unit will investigate the upper-level structure of the obsolete node in the old

version, identify its parent node in the new version, and redirect the messages to that

node. See column 5, lines 10-25.

In reference to dependent claim 5 & 7, Shigemi teaches:

Each structured electronic data object is associated with relevant process scripts

that describe how the individual nodes will behave. See column 5, lines 45-50.

Messages addressed to an obsolete node can still be handled in the new organization

model. Even if the node itself cannot be found in the new version, the structured data

processing unit will investigate the upper-level structure of the obsolete node in the old

version, identify its parent node in the new version, and redirect the messages to that

node. See column 5, lines 10-25.

Another usage of model-specific methods might be a copyright protection of all

SGML instances under a specific DTD. To implement this function, one should define

an operator that will add an electronic signature as an attribute of the SGML instances.

See column 12, lines 35-45.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Shigemi teaches:

Each structured electronic data object is associated with relevant process scripts

that describe how the individual nodes will behave. See column 5, lines 45-50.

Messages addressed to an obsolete node can still be handled in the new organization

model. Even if the node itself cannot be found in the new version, the structured data

processing unit will investigate the upper-level structure of the obsolete node in the old

version, identify its parent node in the new version, and redirect the messages to that

node. See column 5, lines 10-25.

Another usage of model-specific methods might be a copyright protection of all

SGML instances under a specific DTD. To implement this function, one should define

an operator that will add an electronic signature as an attribute of the SGML instances.

See column 12, lines 35-45.

In reference to dependent claim 9, Shigemi teaches:

If there is a structured data object named "organization," which describes an

enterprise's organizational structure. This organization model should be updated to a

new version, each time a change occurs in the enterprise's organization. Suppose here

that one member node of the old structured data object has become obsolete as a

result of changes in the organization. In this case, messages addressed to the obsolete

node can still be handled in the new organization model. Even if the node itself cannot

be found in the new version, the structured data processing unit will investigate the

upper level structure of the obsolete node in the old version. See column 5, lines 10-30.

In reference to dependent claim 13, Shigemi teaches:

Messages generated by a script in a management object to call up another script

in a different management object. See column 9, lines 16-40. Another usage of model-

specific methods might be a copyright protection of all SGML instances under a specific

DTD. To implement this function, one should define an operator that will add an

electronic signature as an attribute of the SGML instances. See column 12, lines 35-45.

In reference to dependent claim 14, Shigemi teaches:

Messages sent from the client process to the processing engine in response to the user's keyboard/mouse operations. See column 9, lines 15-45.

In reference to dependent claim 16, Shigemi teaches:

The message queue actually has two parts; one serves as the temporary storage for event messages, and the other serves as the storage for event log information. The first part of the message cue keeps the messages making a classification according to their originators. The stored information is used to check the present status of each process concerning individuals or some specialized groups. See column 9, lines 57-67.

In reference to dependent claim 17, Shigemi teaches:

The structured data processing unit will investigate the upper-level structure of the obsolete node in the old version, identify its parent node in the new version, and redirect the messages to that node. See column 5, lines 20-25.

In reference to dependent claims 6, 10, 12, and 15, the messages (i.e. messages sent from the client process to the processing engine in response to the user's keyboard/mouse operations, E-mail messages sent from processing engines in other systems, messages sent form the timer event processor at a predetermined time, or messages generated by a script in a management object to call up another script in a different management object) being transmitted would have provided sufficient voice production processing.

In reference to claims 18-23, 28, and 29, the claims recite similar limitations used for performing the methods as claimed in 1-5. In further view of the following, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

In response to appellant's argument that the reference to Shigemi et al., fails to teach or suggest parsing or a document parser unit for converting document data into structured document information. Appellant is referring to the independent claims which state the following limitation:

'a document parser unit for converting document data into structured document information in response to an instruction from the application'

The reference to Shigemi teaches a structured data management system which provides services concerning a structured electronic data object. The proposed system is designed to handle various business documents as one of the structured data objects shown in figure 1. SGML-based documents can readily be subjected to the system. See column 9, lines 10-15. Furthermore, the reference states that the data processing unit analyzes the tree structure of this structured data object to identify a node to be processed. If the data object is a structured document, the reference suggests a means of parsing through a tree structure of a business document to identify nodes to be processed, and then executes a specific process script associated with the identified node. See column 4, lines 41-58.

Appellant argues that the reference to Shigemi fails to teach or suggest an application program that enables structured document information to be referred to by a browser. The processing engine is constructed within a World Wide Web server, while the client process is a WWW browser. Although figure 4 illustrates the processing

engine and client process as separate entities, they can be implemented in a single

machine. The structured data management unit, together with the script interpreter,

works as a server for the external environment outside the processing engine. It

receives and manages SGML documents, or the structural definitions of management

objects (documents), to provide the script interpreter with database services,

responding to queries about nodes. The language, as presently claimed within the

independent claim, fails to preclude the Examiner from utilizing the browser discussed

within the reference and the manipulation of nodes within the business system to

suggest a means of using the document information to be referred to from the

application program. See column 5, lines 1-30 and column 10, lines 1-21.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Ludwig

Assistant Patent Examiner

April 16, 2008

/Matthew J. Ludwig/

Conferees

Stephen Hong

Supervisory Patent Examiner

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Doug Hutton

Supervisory Patent Examiner

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100